

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action mailed March 20, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 17-21 are pending in the application with claims 17 and 18 being in independent form. For the reasons provided below, the claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Summary of Telephonic Interview with Examiner Schell

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Schell for the May 8, 2008 telephonic interview. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed outstanding Office Action and the art applied in the Office Action. No agreement was reached.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078708 A1) in view of a publication entitled "'678': The 666 of DSL Users (hereinafter referred to as "the 678 reference") and Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138785 A1).

Claim 17 is directed to a system for guiding a user through performance of a procedure corresponding to an uninterruptible power supply associated with the system. Specifically, the system comprises:

- at least one programmed processor embedded within or connected to the uninterruptible power supply;
- at least one sensor embedded within or connected to the uninterruptible power supply providing information regarding the status of the uninterruptible power supply, the programmed processor and the sensor being operatively coupled such that the programmed processor receives at least a portion of status information from the sensor;
- the programmed processor being configured to retrieve at least one stored procedure corresponding to the uninterruptible power supply including a plurality of steps to be performed by a user; and
- a display operatively coupled to the uninterruptible power supply for displaying the plurality of steps in order;
- the programmed processor being further configured to determine whether a currently displayed step has been properly performed based upon at least one of: (i) the information

received from the sensor and (ii) one or more inputs entered by a user into the programmed processor, to determine whether a recovery from an error caused by a step which is not properly performed is possible, and, if recovery is possible, to provide one or more *correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the correctional steps to the user on the display.*

As previously argued, Li et al. teach concepts associated with installing peripheral devices to a computer, such as a personal computer, and more particularly to informing the user of a discrete problem, i.e., an improper connection of a cable or the lack of a wireless connection. There is no teaching in Li et al. that the user is notified, after discovering an error, of “whether a *recovery* from [the] error caused by a step which is not properly performed is possible, and, *if recovery is possible, to provide one or more correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the additional steps to the user on the display.*” As stated above, Li et al. inform the user of a failed connection. There is no teaching of providing one or more correctional steps to correct an error. The Examiner acknowledges this in the Office Action.

Hammond et al. teach a UPS power supply critical monitoring system having a monitoring program that listens over a network for information transmitted from the UPS. For example, the information may indicate that the UPS is in a critical state, such as a low battery, an expired battery or a loss of UPS communication with the network. There is no suggestion in Hammond et al. to provide the user with an interactive recovery system for guiding the user through performance of a procedure. Hammond et al. are concerned about informing the user or the operator of a critical condition and recording the critical condition. *See* Hammond et al., paragraph no. [0012], for example. Hammond et al. do not teach recovery from the critical condition, much less Applicants’ claimed programmed processor designed to enable the user or operator to recover from the critical condition by means of a guidance system as set forth in amended claim 17.

The Examiner relies on the 678 reference for teaching a method for resolving the error, and states that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the connection guide system of Li et al. such that in the event of an unsuccessful link to an ISP, instead of displaying an error and redisplaying the same instructions

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

as taught by Li, the system displays additional steps to resolve the error as taught by the 678 reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The 678 reference does not teach the provision of “one or more correctional steps, at least one of which is different from the displayed step, to correct the error by displaying the correctional steps to the user on the display” as set forth in claim 17. The Examiner relies on the following:

“Carrick said users should go to their Start Menu, select “Run,” type “command” and click OK. In the new window, type “NETSH INTERFACE IP RESET LOG.TXT” and hit “Enter” (all commands should be typed without the quotes). Then restart the computer.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the 678 reference does not cure the deficiencies of Li et al. and Hammond et al. Even if properly combined, which the Applicants do not concede, the combination of Li et al., the 678 reference and Hammond et al. do not disclose all of the elements of the Applicants’ claim 17 since the 678 reference would not teach a person skilled in the art to modify Li et al. to display the correctional steps to the user on the display. This feature is not taught by any of the references. Li et al. does not teach this claimed feature and the 678 reference is no different than an instruction manual provided for curing errors associated with any hardware device or related software. The Examiner is reminded that Li et al. only teach displaying an error message. A person skilled in the art, with the knowledge of Li et al. and the 678 reference would not make the leap of displaying correctional steps to cure the error. There is simply no teaching in the references. Because no proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Accordingly, claim 17 is submitted as being patentable over the references of record, including Li et al., the 678 reference and Hammond et al.

As discussed above with reference to claim 17, claim 18 is submitted as being patentable for the same reasons given for claim 17.

Claims 19-21, which depend from claim 18, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons provided for claim 18.

Applicant(s): David A. Colucci et al.
U.S.S.N.: 10/622,952

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the application is believed to be in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Keith F. Noe/
Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7039
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: May 20, 2008
Attorney Docket No.: A2000-708419

893705.1